

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Final Office Action, no amendments to the pending claims are submitted. As such, claims 10–35 remain pending. Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of claims 10–35 in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10–35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nelson et al., (US 2003/0055975) (“Nelson”). Applicants traverse the Examiner’s rejection and point out that, unlike Nelson’s, the Applicants’ “resource” is a logical (vs physical) resource, potentially comprising objects, that may be retrieved, transmitted, stored, or the like by a computer.

Independent claim 10 calls for:

“...retrieving a resource from a remote computer using a plurality of wireless network interfaces,...” (underlining added for emphasis)

Further, independent claim 23 calls for:

“...the resource comprises a plurality of objects;” (underlining added for emphasis)

As such, Applicants submit that claims 10 and 23 are not anticipated by Nelson under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Response After Final
Application Number: 10/695,928
Attorney Docket Number: 304931.01

The present invention specification provides:

“...a request is received to retrieve a resource (e.g., a web page) that may comprise a plurality of objects.” (para 30, lines 1–2; underlining added for emphasis)

“...the computing device at the destination address (typically a server) transmits the resource to the requesting address.” (para 33, lines 9–11; underlining added for emphasis)

“The portions of the resource may be stored in cache memory, or may be transmitted...” (para 34, lines 5–6; underlining added for emphasis)

Nelson, on the other hand provides:

“The bearer services system components 180 can provide the server 110 with the data connectivity to a plurality of ground-based servers. The bearer services system components 180 may include a plurality of components including an Airborne Communications Unit (ACU) 205, a Wireless Gate-link system (WGS) 182, a Satellite Data Unit (SDU) 195, and a Terrestrial Flight Telephone system (TFTS) 200. The WGS 182 may be, for example, a wireless LAN transceiver (as shown in FIG. 1) based on the IEEE 802.11 specifications which can allow transfer of high-speed data to the server 110 in

the airport when the aircraft (moving object) is on the ground. The ACU may act as the gateway to a ground-based data center via the North American Terrestrial System (NATS) network. Although the present invention is described with reference to the NATS network, the NATS network is solely exemplary and alternative communication networks may be used for providing air-to-ground data communication services.” (Nelson, para 30; underlining added for emphasis)

Applicants claim a resource that is a logical (vs physical) entity, such as a “web page”; a resource that can be “retrieved... from a remote computer”, “transmitted”, “stored in cache memory”, and the like. Further, as the Applicants’ claimed resource is a logical entity, any objects of which it is comprised are also logical entities. The logical nature of Applicants’ resource is further made clear in the preamble of independent claim 10.

Nelson, on the other hand, discloses “components” or, as stated by the Examiner, a “bearer service unit” (FOA pg. 2, last para, line 4)—a physical object or objects. As such, Nelson’s “bearer service unit” is fundamentally different than the Applicants’ claimed resource. As such, Nelson does not disclose, teach, or suggest a resource that can be retrieved, transmitted, or stored by a computer as claimed by the Applicants. Further, Nelson does not disclose, teach, or suggest a logical entity, such as Applicants’ resource, comprised of other logical entities, such as Applicants’ objects.

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 10 and 23 are not anticipated by Nelson under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claims 11–22 are dependent on claim 10. As such, claims 11–22 are believed allowable, at least in part, based upon claim 10.

Claims 24–35 are dependent on claim 23. As such, claims 23–35 are believed allowable, at least in part, based upon claim 23.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application is requested.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Response After Final
Application Number: 10/695,928
Attorney Docket Number: 304931.01

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: March 20, 2007

By: /L. Alan Collins/

L. Alan Collins, Reg. No.: 57,646
Direct telephone (425) 703-8265
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

March 20, 2007
Date


Signature

Rimma N. Oks
Type or Print Name

Response After Final
Application Number: 10/695,928
Attorney Docket Number: 304931.01